DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 836 HE 026 256

AUTHOR Mauch, James E.; And Others
TITLE Emeritus Rank in Pennsylvania Colleges and Universities: Retiree Perquisites and Privileges.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *Aging in Academia; *College Faculty; Colleges; Data Collection; *Faculty College Relationship; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Retirement; *Retirement Benefits; School Policy; State Universities; Teacher Rights
IDENTIFIERS *Emeritus Professors; *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This paper is part of a series of studies designed to ascertain what policies and practices, if any, are currently in effect regarding rights and privileges connected with retirement in higher education. This study sought information about the perquisites furnished to retired higher education faculty in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through a questionnaire sent to the state's degree-granting institutions, of which 83 replied for a response rate of 54%. Among the findings, it was determined that: (1) of the 48 rights and privileges listed in the study questionnaire, all but one--the right of retiree associations to use campus rooms--can be found on one or more of the state campuses; (2) the most frequently awarded prerequisites related to encouraging retirees to participate in campus social, organizational, and recreational life; (3) emeriti received more rights and privileges than retired faculty in general; (4) the rights and privileges considered most desirable were related to retaining insurance, opportunities to teach, pre-retirement counseling, and office space; (5) the least desirable rights and privileges included having their own center on campus, having an association of retired faculty, and having representation of the retired faculty on senate and faculty councils; and (6) Pennsylvania institutions of higher education provide fewer perquisites than do American Association of Universities institutions. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354836

EMERITUS RANK IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES:

RETIREE PERQUISITES AND PRIVILEGES

JAMES E. MAUCH
JACK W. BIRCH
Jack Matthews

HE026256

James E. Mauch is Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, and a Former President of the University Senate.

Jack W. Birch is Professor Emeritus of Psychology in Education at the University of Pittsburgh, and formerly and Associate Dean and a Chairperson.

Jack Matthews is Emeritus Professor in the Department of Communation and the Cleft Palate/Craniofacial Center at the University of Pittsburgh.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James E. Mauch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

EMERITUS RANK IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES:

RETIREE PERQUISITES AND PRIVILEGES

JAMES E. MAUCH
JACK W. BIRCH
Jack Matthews

Higher education institutions, whether small colleges or large universities, have or will have their cohorts of retired faculty. Moreover, as life expectancy increases, so will the size and longevity and the potential influence of that group of retirees. Consequently, most if not all, colleges and universities have in common the need to come to terms with the nature of the relationship they wish to maintain with faculty members who have retired or are about to retire.

EMERITUS RANK IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: RETIREE PERQUISITES AND PRIVILEGES

JAMES E. MAUCH

JACK W. BIRCH

Jack Matthews

University of Pittsburgh

Higher education institutions, whether small colleges or large universities, have or will have their cohorts of retired faculty. Moreover, as life expectancy increases, so will the size and longevity and the potential influence of that group of retirees. Consequently, most if not all, colleges and universities have in common the need to come to terms with the nature of the relationship they wish to maintain with faculty members who have retired or are about to retire.

It is relatively easy to define a hoped-for style of interaction between retirees and their former employers in broad collegial terms, particularly when everything is framed in terms of intentions. Some faculty members and groups (Albert, 1986), some professional organizations like the AAU (1988), and many individual colleges and universities have made solid strides toward converting statements of good intentions into specific assurances that retirement will be accompanied by definite benefits and privileges that will establish the basis for continuing linkages between the retiree and the institution, to their mutual satisfaction and advantage. This paper is devoted to an examination of the nature and prevalence of the rights and eligibilities extended as a matter of policy and uniform practice by the employing institution to faculty retirees.

Retired faculty currently play many roles in connection with their former employers. Post-retirement activities range from none at all through teaching, tutoring, research and other scholarly work to consultation in regard to new programs, student advisement, faculty evaluation and recruitment, lobbying, fund-raising, initiating training and research grants, and making bequests themselves (Mauch, Birch and Matthews, 1990b). College and university personnel policies today often clearly acknowledge the importance of retired faculty by awarding them certain rights and privileges. By doing so, the institutions demonstrate that they place value upon positive, continuing interactions with retired faculty and wish to encourage such relationships.

In another report (Mauch, Birch and Matthews, 1990a) it was pointed out that there is growing interest in what specific rights, benefits, opportunities and privileges are extended as a matter of course to faculty retirees. A 1986 amendment to the Age Discrimina-tion in Employment Act calls for removing any compulsory retirement age for tenured faculty by December 31, 1993. This provides both motivation and a certain urgency to examine more closely the present and possible future roles of older higher education faculty members. This paper provides information about the perquisites furnished to retired faculty by the degree-granting institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That group of colleges and universities includes examples of most types of American higher education institutions. While not a truly representative sample of U.S. degree-granting schools, the responses from them to our inquiries should give a useful approximation of the national picture.

Eighty-three Pennsylvania higher education institutions responded to our questionnaire. This represents a response rate of approximately 54%. The questions asked were designed to reveal answers to the following:

1. What rights and privileges are most frequently provided to retirees and emeriti?
2. Are there differences in the awarding of rights and privileges between faculty retirees in general and those who attain emeritus status?
3. Are there notable differences among Pennsylvania schools in the degree to which they offer retiree perquisites?
4. What perquisites do administrators consider most desirable and least desirable for retired faculty from their institutions?
5. To what extent, if at all, are higher education institutions planning to add to the rights and privileges they now extend to faculty retirees?
6. How do the rights and privileges supplied by the broad Pennsylvania sample of schools compare in kind and in frequency with those provided by members of the American Association of Universities (AAU), a select group of large, well-recognized U.S. and Canadian research-oriented universities.

The answer to the first of the questions, "What rights and privileges are most frequently provided to retirees and emeriti?", is given in what follows. The specific perquisites provided are grouped

under seven policy headings. The policies were identified by a cluster analysis procedure described in a paper referred to earlier (Mauch, Birch and Matthews, 1990a).

Within policy groupings, perquisites are ranked, highest to lowest, according to the percentage of schools in Pennsylvania that provide the privileges or services to <u>all</u> faculty retirees, with the highest percentage first.

Each numbered item under a policy group is preceded by 2 percentage figures enclosed in parentheses [( )]. The first percentage figure indicates the proportion of respondents who indicated, "Yes, this applies to all our retired faculty." The second percentage figure is the proportion of respondents who indicated, "Yes, but applies <u>only</u> to those faculty with emeritus status."

At the end of each item is another pair of percentage figures, this time underscored [___]. They will be used later in discussing the answer to the sixth question posed above relating to differences between Pennsylvania and AAU institutions. The underscored percentage figures refer to the responses from AAU institutions which we reported in an earlier paper (Mauch, Birch and Matthews, 1990a).

<u>POLICY ONE</u>: Retirement counseling, information, and health and life insurance benefits are due each retiree. Personal and financial advisement shall be available during the period prior to retirement and after retirement, with respect to retirement benefit.

[( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (53-00) Pre-retirement information is provided for faculty.
<u>85-00</u>

2. (34-06) Health insurance continues, paid in whole or part by the institution. 49-04

3. (25-00) Pre-retirement counseling is provided. 25-00

4. (22-02) Life insurance continues, paid in whole or part by the institution. 34-02

5. (13-00) Post-retirement counseling is provided. 32-00

POLICY TWO: Retirees are encouraged to participate in campus social, organizational and recreational life. This includes access and opportunities to continue taking part in those events available prior to transfer to retirement status, plus added social, organizational and recreational activities that arise after retirement.

[( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (77-05) Retirees remain on mailing lists, if desired. 64-13

2. (57-08) Social and recreational facilities may be used. 81-09

3. (55-13) Campus publications and notices are sent. 55-13

4. (48-05) Cultural events may be attended under the same conditions as regular faculty. 77-09

5. (43-02) There is access to school or alumni travel services. 70-02

6. (36-04) Athletic events may be attended under the same conditions as regular faculty. 75-09

7. (34-08) Faculty discounts are given at the bookstore. 32-09

8. (30-02) Credit union activities are available. 68-04

9. (25-04) Faculty dining privileges are continued. 47-13

10. (08-01) Faculty club membership is available. 47-06

POLICY THREE: Retirees are made welcome as continuing members of the general campus academic/professional community.

[( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (45-13) Invitations to campus functions are sent, as in the case of regular faculty. 38-21
2. (33-19) Invitations are sent to participate in commencement exercises. 26-21
3. (31-11) Retirees are regularly invited to participate in seminars, colloquia, lectures, and other scholarly meetings. 20-09
4. (29-34) Retirees are listed in college/university catalogues. 19-38
5. (28-11) ID cards (or equivalent) are issued. 72-09
6. (27-19) Retirees remain on the mailing lists, if desired. 64-13
7. (24-06) Names may be listed in the campus speaker roster. 26-06

POLICY FOUR: Retirees are encouraged by their departments and school to maintain a continuing and voluntary involvement in their current academic/professional activities and affairs.

[( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (70-08) Retirees have regular library privileges. 77-15
2. (48-05) Academic courses may be audited. 64-06
3. (35-10) Regular faculty parking privileges are provided. 51-26
4. (23-07) Retirees may serve in a variety of advisory and

consultant roles on campus. 28-13

5. (22-15) Retirees may have a campus address and use regular faculty mail privileges. 32-30

6. (15-04) Retirees may represent the institution on department, school, campus or state committees. 15-04

7. (10-10) Departmental telephone use is available. 11-32

8. (04-13) Departmental office space is available. 30-06

9. (04-05) Retirees are invited to attend faculty meetings. 17-15

10. (04-05) Retirees serve on departmental committees. 15-13

POLICY FIVE: Inducements and support are given to retirees to continue to teach and advise students part-time.

[( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (41-05) Opportunities are given to teach as needed. 30-06

2. (18-05) Retirees are given preference for part-time teaching jobs. 06-00

3. (12-02) Retirees are eligible to serve on committees for theses and dissertations. 23-17

4. (08-12) Usual faculty mailing privileges are available. 21-23

5. (07-13) Secretarial service is available. 06-2

POLICY SIX: Continuation of research and scholarly activity by retirees is favored and fostered.

[( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (22-07) Opportunities are provided to pursue unfunded research and scholarly projects in the retiree's field,

using institutional facilities. 26-21

2. (21-17) Retirees may use computers, word processors, laboratories, instruments, supplies, observatories and the like necessary to their continued research and scholarly work. 11-28
3. (13-07) Grants, contracts, awards and other funds for research and scholarly work may be received. 34-17
4. (08-04) There is eligibility to receive institutional support for grant proposals submitted to funding agencies. 28-15
5. (06-02) Help is available with the cost of producing scholarly publications, including page and permission fees. 15-06
6. (02-00) There is eligibility for funds for help in defraying travel costs for presentations at professional meetings. 09-04

POLICY SEVEN: Campus facilities are made available for organizations of retirees to meet and to establish a presence in the institution.

I ( ) = Pennsylvania __ = AAU]

1. (23-01) The retiree association has representation on senate and faculty councils. 40-02
2. (05-01) Retirees have an established association here. 32-06
3. (00-01) There is a retiree center on campus. 09-00
4. (00-00) A retiree association may use campus meeting rooms.

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES AWARDED TO RETIREES AND EMERITI

All but one of the rights and privileges in our list of forty-eight can be found on one or more of the eighty-three campuses from which we received responses. The sole absentee is the right for a retiree association to use campus meeting rooms.

To locate perquisites most frequently furnished, use the percentage figures in the parentheses before each item. For example, look at item one under POLICY TWO. It indicates that 77 percent of respond-ing institutions in Pennsylvania offer all retirees the privilege of remaining on mailing lists, if desired. By adding the second percentage in the parentheses to the first thus combining schools that hold the mailing list privilege to retirees with emeritus rank only with those that offer the privilege to all retired faculty, it is seen that 82 percent of our sample, or sixty-nine of the eighty-three responding institutions, provide that perquisite as a regular practice.

Using the above combining procedure we note that ten of the list of forty-eight rights and privileges are standard perquisites in more than half of the colleges and universities from which we received replies. While we do not propose that those ten make up a "typical" set of perquisites supplied by higher education institutions, an analysis of the kind just described may be thought of as one way, at least, to get a sense of current prevailing practices. Noteworthy, also, is the fact that seven of the most frequently awarded perquisites are linked to POLICIES TWO and THREE.

DIFFERENCES IN AWARDS FOR EMERITI AND ALL RETIRED FACULTY

There is clearly a tendency to distinguish between faculty retirees in general and those faculty retirees who are awarded emeritus status.Emeriti for the most part receive more rights and privileges. Moreover, the emeritus retiree is likely to have a perquisite profile that is tied closely to actual participation in research and departmental affairs

To illustrate the above, 45 percent of the respondents said that they assigned more perquisites to emeriti than to retirees in general. The additional number, on the average, was five. Also, nine respondents (11 percent) gave emeriti double or more the total perquisites they gave other retired faculty. The average number of perquisites for faculty retirees in general was ten, (Range: 0-32) while the average for emeriti was fifteen (Range: 0-33).

DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOLS IN PERQUISITES AWARDED

A look back at the parentheses in front of the forty-eight perquisites about which Pennsylvania colleges and universities were queried shows that the enclosed percentages are relatively small, in the main. That suggests that not many schools offered any one of the perquisites. In other words, there are substantial differences, from school to school, in which specific perquisites were granted.

Another way to illustrate that same finding is this: Four schools each awarded exactly fifteen perquisites, which was the average number awarded. A frequency distribution was made of the number of perquisites the four had marked in common. Five perqui-sites were common to the

four schools; eight others were common to three of the schools; and six others were common to two of the schools. Thus, in this "average school" sample, only a third of the perquisites offered were common in all four schools.

The above information reinforces our caution about suggesting that there has yet emerged in the higher education community any really "typical" package of perquisites for faculty retirees. Perhaps in some localities different privileges and rights are more attractive to faculty or more feasible for administration. Whatever the reason, the results of this inquiry show that there is far from unanimity on what perquisites ought to be offered to retired facult

MOST AND LEAST DESIRABLE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGE

The fourth question addressed in this investigation is, "What perquisites do administrators consider most desirable and least desirable for retired faculty from their institutions?" The four most desirable and the four least desirable (by frequency of mention from respondents) are listed below, in order of times mentioned.

Most Desirable

1. Retired faculty retain health insurance paid in full or in part by the institution.
2. Retired faculty are offered opportunities to teach, as needed.
3. Pre-retirement counseling is provided to faculty.
4. Departmental office space is available for retired faculty.

Least Desirable

1. Retired faculty have their own center on campus.

2. Their is established an association of retired faculty here.

3. Our retired faculty association has representation on senate and faculty councils.

4. Retired faculty are eligible for help in defraying travel costs for presentations at professional meetings.

In the colleges and universities represented in respondents from the Pennsylvania degree-granting institutions there are no surprises among the rights and privileges checked as most desirable by administrators. In fact, the four listed are already among the most commonly offered perquisites. We would assume that the rights and privileges already granted were the results of prior administrative decisions and that the responses just noted are confirmations of these earlier actions.

It is tempting to speculate about why the first three perqui-sites on the least desirable list were chosen. Might it reflect a desire on the part of administrators to distance themselves from any additional potential pressure groups? Or might it be that retiree organizations and representation may already be sufficient and that other retiree benefits hold more promise of value to both the retiree and the school? Whatever the motivation, the administrative preferences are clear and must be reckoned with in any short or long range planning by either party.

PLANS TO ADD TO THE PERQUISITES FOR RETIREES

From this study one can determine only plans with respect to the 48 items included in our inquiry form. It may be that there are other

rights and privileges contemplated by either faculty or administration about which we have no data. With that limitation in mind, our main finding is that there are very few plans to begin offering more benefits to retired faculty in the immediate future. Only thirteen of the eighty-three schools who answered (16 percent) indicated any plans at all to add perquisites linked to retirement. One institution planned to initiate five new ones, two planned to start two more each, and the remaining ten had plans for only one each.

There is another category of response that deserves to be noted in this connection. Our questionnaire allowed the one responding to indicate that a perquisite was provided to a retiree "informally", that is, not necessarily as a common practice and not necessarily for all retirees. The average number of such responses were seperated out and were not counted in the data already reported. But it could be that certain of these "informal" items are on their way to becoming a permanent part of the "firm" perquisite list of the school and, thus, could be viewed as items now planned. A possibility of that kind is suggested only, since we have no confirmation of it in our responses.

COMPARISON OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AND AAU INSTITUTIONS

The sixth and final question posed in this paper asks, "How do the rights and privileges supplied by the broad Pennsylvania sample of schools compare in kind and frequency with those offered by the AAU, a select group of large, well-recognized U.S. and Canadian research-oriented universities?"

A comparison of the number of perquisites that go regularly to all retired faculty shows the AAU institutions (Mauch, Birch and Matthews

1990a) to be more generous than are the schools in the broader Pennsylvania sample. Of the rights and privileges listed in our inquiry:

75 percent of AAU members gave at least five, or 10 percent of the forty-eight;

50 of AAU members gave at least thirteen, or 27 percent of the forty-eight;

25 percent of AAU members gave at least thirty-one, or 65 percent of the forty-eight.

In contrast:

75 percent of Pennsylvania schools gave at least one, or 2 percent of the forty-eight;

50 percent of Pennsylvania schools gave at least five, or 10 percent of the forty-eight.

25 of Pennsylvania schools gave at least twenty-two, or 46 percent of the forty-eight.

There seems to be little room for doubt that the AAU members are solidly in the lead in the number of perquisites a faculty member might expect to accompany retirement.

Given that the AAU exceeds the Pennsylvania schools in terms of number of perquisites, are there also differences of kind? It is possible, by turning back to the rights and privileges listed earlier in this paper, to get a sense of the degree to which qualitative differences might be present. If one compares the parenthesized percentages (Pennsylvania) with the underscored percentages (AAU), it can be determined whether there are noteworthy differences in emphasis

between the two groups.

For example, Item five (5) under POLICY ONE, Items eight (8) and ten (10) under POLICY TWO, Items five (5) and (6) under POLICY THREE, and Items eight (8), nine (9), and ten (10) under POLICY FOUR are all instances in which the "all faculty" AAU percentages are more than double the Pennsylvania percentages. Such sizable differences argue for the notion that they represent true differences in institutional attitudes about their importance. Other items with similarly large differences can be found under POLICIES FIVE, SIX, and SEVEN. In the great majority, the differences are in favor of the AAU members and they tend to reflect greater interest in opening opportunities for the retiree to continue with the kind of academic/professional teaching, research and scholarly work carried on prior to retirement.

SUMMARY

This paper is part of a series of studies designed to learn what policies and practices, if any, are currently in effect regarding rights and privileges connected with retirement in higher education (Mauch, Birch and Matthews 1990b). In the present study we sought information about the perquisites furnished to retired higher education faculty in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Eighty-three Pennsylvania higher education institutions responded to our inquiry by filling out a questionnaire indicating which of forty-eight rights and privileges were provided retired faculty. An analysis of the eighty-three responses indicated:

1. Of the forty-eight rights and privileges listed in our questionnaire all but one---the right for retiree associations to

use campus meeting rooms—can be found on one or more of the eighty-three Pennsylvania campuses.

2. Using a cluster analysis procedure mentioned earlier, seven policies were identified.

POLICY ONE: Providing retirement counseling, information, and insurance benefits.

POLICY TWO: Encouraging retirees to participate in campus social, organizational and recreational life.

POLICY THREE: Making retirees welcome as continuing members of the general academic/professional community.

POLICY FOUR: Encouraging retirees through their departments and schools to maintain a continuing involvement in their current academic/professional activities and affairs.

POLICY FIVE: Providing inducements and support to retirees to continue to teach and advise students part-time.

POLICY SIX: Favoring and fostering the continuation of research and scholarly activity.

POLICY SEVEN: Making campus facilities available for organizations of retirees to meet and to establish a presence in the institution.

3. A large number of the most frequently awarded perquisites are related to encouraging retirees to participate in campus social, organizational and recreational life and to feel welcome as continuing members of the general academic/professional community.
4. Emeriti for the most part receive more rights and privileges than do retired faculty in general.
5. There are substantial differences from school to school in the

perquisites granted.

6. There are widespread differences of opinion concerning which perquisites ought to be offered retired faculty.
7. The rights and privileges considered most desirable related to retaining insurance, opportunities to teach, pre-retirement counseling and office space.
8. The rights and privileges considered least desirable related to retirees having their own center on campus, having an association of retired faculty, having representation of the retired faculty on senate and faculty councils and help in defraying travel costs for presentations at professional meetings.
9. There are few plans to begin offering more benefits in the near future.
10. Pennsylvania institutions of higher education provide fewer perquisites than do AAU institutions.
11. The smaller number of perquisites provided by Pennsylvania institutions tends to reflect a lesser interest in opening opportunities for retirees to continue their academic/ professional teaching, research and scholarly work.

REFERENCES

AAUP. "Statement on Principles on Academic Retirement and Insurance Plans." Academe, 74 (January-February, 1988): 37-38.

Albert, Sydney P. "Retirement: From Rite to Rights." Academe 72 (July-August 1986): 24-26.

Mauch, James; Birch, Jack W. and Matthews, Jack. 1989a. "Emeritus Rank in Major Research Universities." Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh.

Mauch, James; Birch, Jack W. and Matthews, Jack. The Emeritus Professor: Old Rank-New Meaning. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1990b.